

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	D. F	ILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/660,190 09/11/2003		09/11/2003	Eric D. Groen	X-1420 US 5845		
24309	7590	11/08/2006		EXAMINER		
XILINX,	INC		FILE, ERIN M			
ATTN: LE	EGAL DEPA	RTMENT				
2100 LOGIC DR				' ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SAN JOSE, CA 95124				2611		

DATE MAILED: 11/08/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		51	/
	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/660,190	GROEN, ERIC D.	
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Erin M. File	2611	
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the o	orrespondence address	
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL' WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a repty be tirg will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from a, cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	
Status	,		
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 11 S	entember 2003		
	s action is non-final.		
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa		secution as to the merits is	
closed in accordance with the practice under E			
Disposition of Claims			
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5) ☐ Claim(s) 19-23 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 1-6,15-17 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) 7-14 and 18 is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.		
Application Papers		·	
9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examine 10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 September 2003 is Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Example 11.	are: a)⊠ accepted or b)⊡ object drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Se tion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). ejected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).	
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119			
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicat rity documents have been receiv u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ion No ed in this National Stage	
Attachment(s)			
 Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/16/2004. 	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail D 5) Notice of Informal I 6) Other:	ate	

Application/Control Number: 10/660,190 Page 2

Art Unit: 2611

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lutkemeyer (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0049812) in view of Nascimento (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0024103) and Tomlinson et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0104031).
 Claim 1, Lutkemeyer discloses a multi-giga bit transceiver (MGT, abstract, lines 1-3) including:
 - first MGT circuitry for performing a first MGT function (fig. 1, 30, circuit A performing a first function);
 - second MGT circuitry for performing a second MGT function (fig. 1, 32, circuit B performing a second function);

Lutkemeyer fails to disclose:

 at least one regulated power source and at least one unregulated power source, both coupled to selectively provide regulated and unregulated power to the first and second MGT circuitry; Application/Control Number: 10/660,190

Art Unit: 2611

 programmable logic for providing control signals to select and operatively couple the first and second MGT circuitry to one of the at least one regulated and unregulated power sources.

However, Nascimento discloses:

 at least one regulated power source and at least one unregulated power source, both coupled to selectively provide regulated and unregulated power to the first and second MGT circuitry (abstract, lines 5-11);

As Nascimento discloses that his invention keeps power losses very low ([0017], lines 5-7) it would be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the power sources as disclosed by Nascimento into the invention of Lutkemeyer. Naciemento fails to disclose:

 programmable logic for providing control signals to select and operatively couple the first and second MGT circuitry to one of the at least one regulated and unregulated power sources.

However, Tomlinson discloses a switch programmable logic for providing control signals to select and operatively couple the first and second MGT circuitry to one of the at least one regulated and unregulated power sources (abstract).

Because programmable power management allows for more efficient use power in a circuit, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the power switching and regulation as disclosed by Tomlinson into the combined invention of Lutkemeyer and Nascimento.

Claim 2, Nascimento further discloses at least one regulated power source comprises an unregulated supply and a plurality of power regulators (abstract,

lines 5, 8-9, first and second power regulators are disclosed) and Tomlinson discloses selective coupling of power from the supply to the first and second circuitry (abstract).

- 3. Claims 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lutkemeyer (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0049812), Nascimento (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0024103), and Tomlinson et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0104031) as applied to claims 1, 2 above, and further in view of Liu (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0169416).

 Claims 3-5, although neither Lutkemeyer, Nascimento, nor Tomlinson discloses the first MGT circuitry comprises a phase-locked loop (PLL), Liu discloses a transceiver which uses a phase lock loop which provides timing for the transmitting and receiving functions of the transceiver ([0006]). Because phase locked loops are well known in the art for the advantage of providing synchrionized clocks in a transmitter or receiver, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the phase locked loops as disclosed by Liu into the combined invention of Lutkemeyer, Nascimento, and Tomlinson.
- 4. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lutkemeyer (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0049812), Nascimento (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0024103), Tomlinson et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0104031), and Liu (U.S. Pub. No. 2005/0169416) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Agarwal et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0212394).

Claim 6, Lutkemeyer, Nascimento, Tomlinson, and Liu fail to disclose a serial-in-parallel-out circuitry, Agarwal discloses a receiver serial-in-parallel-out circuitry (Rx SIPO) [0031]. The use of a serial-in-parallel-out circuitry allows for faster data processing at the receiver end and would therefore be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the serial-in-parallel-out as disclosed by Agarwal into the combined invention of Lutkemeyer, Nascimento, Tomlinson, and Liu.

5. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khamis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,729) in view of Brambilla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,359) and Beck (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0020842).

Claim 15, Khamis discloses:

 a voltage regulator with an output node coupled a selectable switch to selectively provide regulated power to at least one of a transmit PLL (col. 14, lines 38-41)

Khamis fails to disclose:

 a current mirror having a reference current stage and selectable current mirror stages for providing one of a plurality of current levels into an output node

However, Brambilla discloses:

 a current mirror having a reference current stage and selectable current mirror stages for providing one of a plurality of current levels into an output node (col. 13, lines 53, col. 13, line 63 – col. 14, line 2) Brambilla discloses that current mirror ciruits in voltage regulators have the advantage of having excellent response speeds, even at high frequencies (col. 2, lines 51-56). Because of this advantage it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the current mirror circuit as disclosed by Brambilla into the invention of Khamis. Neither Khamis nor Brambilla disclose:

 a voltage regulator stage coupled to adjustably sink current from and source current to the output node to maintain a specified output voltage at the output node

However, Beck discloses:

 a voltage regulator stage coupled to adjustably sink current from and source current to the output node to maintain a specified output voltage at the output node (abstract)

Beck further discloses that this type of voltage regulation has the advantage of providing self-configurability in a transceiver environment ([011], lines 15-17). Because of this advantage it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the voltage regulator with current sink and source as disclosed by Beck into the combined invention of into the invention of Khamis and Brambilla.

6. Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khamis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,729), Brambilla et al. (U.S. Patent No.

6,072,359), and Beck (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0020842) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Agarwal et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0212394).

Claim 16, Khamis discloses a selectively coupled output. Neither Khamis, Brambilla, nor Beck discloses a serial-in-parallel-out circuitry, Agarwal discloses a receiver serial-in-parallel-out circuitry (Rx SIPO) [0031]. The use of a serial-in-parallel-out circuitry allows for faster data processing at the receiver end and would therefore be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to incorporate the serial-in-parallel-out as disclosed by Agarwal into the combined invention of Khamis, Brambilla, and Beck.

7. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khamis et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,930,729), Brambilla et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,359), and Beck (U.S. Pub. No. 2001/0020842) as applied to claim 15 above, and further in view of Bourke et al. (U.S. Patent No. 3,656,006).

Claim 17, Neither Khamis, Brambilla, nor Beck discloses the voltage regulator stage further includes an amplifier and a voltage divider with selectable divider resistors to create selectable voltage divider ratios, the voltage divider coupled to an input of the amplifier. However, Bourke discloses an amplifier and a voltage divider with selectable divider resistors to create selectable voltage divider ratios, the voltage divider coupled to an input of the amplifier (col. 4, lines 54-65).

Selectable voltage divider ratios allow for more robust and flexible design and would therefore be obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of invention to

incorporate the voltage dividing as disclosed by Bourke into the combined invention of Khamis, Brambilla, and Beck.

Allowable Subject Matter

- 8. Claims 7-14, 18 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 9. Claims 19-23 are allowed.
- 10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The limitation of claim 19 regarding selecting between regulated power and unregulated power and generating corresponding control signals to circuitry for generating the transmitter and receiver clocks and circuitry for converting the parallel data into serial data is not found in the prior art of record.
- 11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Erin M. File whose telephone number is (571)272-6040. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 10:00-6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mohammad Ghayour can be reached on (571) 272-3021. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Erin M. File

EMF

11/1/2006

MOHAMMED OHAYOUR
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER